

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present patent application is respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 3-22 are pending in this application.

On September 11, 2006, a telephone interview was conducted with Patent Examiner McDieunel Marc regarding the June 5, 2006 Office action. Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview. By this amendment, claims 1, 12, 18, and 19 have been amended, claims 20-22 have been canceled, and new claim 23 has been added. Applicants believe the amendments are consistent with the discussions during the interview and a rejection of the amended claims is not supported by the art of record.

Claims 1, and 3-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Breed (USPN 6,738,697). Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 19 to recite, in part, "loading a stop timer once the signal has been received . . . allowing the vehicle to be operable if the stop time has expired and another signal requesting the vehicle to stop has not been received" and "loading a stop timer . . . permitting the vehicle to move if the stop time has expired and another stop signal has not been received," respectively.

Applicants' respectfully submit that Breed does not disclose utilizing a stop timer. Thus, applicants submit that the rejection of amended claims 1 and 19, along with the claims that depend therefrom, are unsupported by the art of record and should be withdrawn.

New claim 23 is fully supported by the specification and is distinguished over the art of record, at least by its dependency from claim 1.

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that all of the claims in this case are now in condition for allowance and an indication to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 2, 2006

By: MR/Hull
Mark R. Hull, Reg. No. 54,753
(216) 622-8419